

## **REMARKS**

Applicants have amended claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-23, and 25-29, and have cancelled claims 11, 19, and 24, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims, and to pursue other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants respectfully request that the present final office-action be changed to as non-final office action, because claim 10 was rejected on a new ground of rejection (under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears), said new ground of rejection not necessitated by an amendment of claim 10. Claim 10 had previously been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Carro. Note that claim 10 had been amended to be rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1 and is otherwise the same claim 10 as was originally filed. See MPEP 706.07(a): “Under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) ...”

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12, 15-17, 20-23, 26-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carro et al. (hereinafter Carro) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087598 published July 4, 2002, in view of Sussman et al. (hereinafter

Sussman) U.S. Patent No. 5,586,196 issued Dec. 17, 1996, in further view of Sears et al.

(hereinafter Sears) U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482 filed Oct. 22, 1998.

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carro et al. (hereinafter Carro) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087598 published July 4, 2002, in view of Sussman et al. (hereinafter Sussman) U.S. Patent No. 5,586,196 issued Dec. 17, 1996, in further view of Sears et al. (hereinafter Sears) U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482 filed Oct. 22, 1998, in view of Schneider et al. (hereinafter Schneider) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156866 filed Apr. 19, 2001.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-14, 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carro et al. (hereinafter Carro) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087598 published July 4, 2002, in view of Sussman et al. (hereinafter Sussman) U.S. Patent No. 5,586,196 issued Dec. 17, 1996, in further view of Sears et al. (hereinafter Sears) U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482 filed Oct. 22, 1998, in view of Reichel et al. (hereinafter Reichel) U.S. Patent No. 5,960,448 filed Dec. 1995.

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1-10, 12, 15-17, 20-23, 26-27 and 29**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12, 15-17, 20-23, 26-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carro et al. (hereinafter Carro) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087598 published July 4, 2002, in view of Sussman et al. (hereinafter Sussman) U.S. Patent No. 5,586,196 issued Dec. 17, 1996, in further view of Sears et al. (hereinafter Sears) U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482 filed Oct. 22, 1998.

**Claims 1-9, 12, 15-17, 20-23, 26-27 and 29**

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, because Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

A first example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears is that Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not teach or suggest the feature: “identifying a physical document; identifying and locating an electronic copy of said identified physical document, wherein the electronic copy of the document is an exact replica of the physical document.”

The Example argues: “Carro teaches ... Identifying a physical document (See Para 76,154) ... Identifying and locating an electronic copy of said identified document (see Para 90,148, 165)”.

In response, Applicant respectfully contends that Carro, Pars. [0090], [0148], and [0165] do not disclose “ identifying and locating an electronic copy of said identified physical document, wherein the electronic copy of the document is an exact replica of the physical document”.

Carro, Par. [0090] recites “receiving and storing in said hyperlink table identification and location of information or service associated with each defined hyperlinked item” which discloses a hyperlink table that is not disclosed by Carro as being an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document identified in Carro, Par. [0076].

Carro, Par. [0148] discloses multimedia information that is not disclosed by Carro as being an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document identified in Carro, Par. [0076].

Carro, Par. [0090] discloses a hyperlink table that is not disclosed by Carro as being an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document identified in Carro, Par. [0076].

Therefore, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 1.

A second example of why claim 1 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears is that Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not teach or suggest the feature: “retrieving, from the electronic copy of the physical document, data related to the selected part of the physical document”.

The Example argues: “Carro teaches ... retrieving from the electronic copy of the physical document, data related to the selected part of the document (See Para 116)”.

In response, Applicant notes that Carro, Pars. [0116] recites: “an user workstation for accessing the information and/or the service associated with the hyperlinked items”, which does not even mention an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document, let alone

retrieving, from the electronic copy exact replica of the physical document, data related to the selected part of the document.

The bottom line is that the preceding feature of claim 1 claims retrieving data, related to the selected part of the document, from the electronic copy replica of the physical document, which Carro does not disclose.

Therefore, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 1.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-9, 12, 15-17, 20-23 and 25-29 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2-9, 12, 15-17, 20-23 and 25-29 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In addition with respect to claim 12, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not disclose the feature: “enhancing on a screen the electronic copy of the selected part of the physical document to match a preferred reading view of the visually impaired person”.

The Examiner argues: “With respect to **dependent claims 8-9, 12** as indicated in the above discussion Carro in view of Sussman, in further view of Sears teach the limitations of claim 1... Carro does not teach presenting retrieved data visually to the visually impaired person by magnifying the data on the screen. However, Sussman teaches a system that presents data to a visually impaired person after scanning a physical document (see column 1, lines 50-67 and

column 15, top and Column 26, lines 45-67 and column 27, lines 1-67). Carro and Sussman teach systems that scan a location on a document to retrieve information and then present the information to the user. Sussman teaches reading the physical document location information by reading column and line information (See column 23 and 24). Sussman expressly recites formatting and presenting document information for a user that is visually impaired”.

In response, Applicant respectfully contends that the preceding argument by the Examiner has not addressed the preceding feature of claim 12. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in relation to claim 12.

Accordingly, claim 12 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears.

In addition with respect to claim 16, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not disclose the feature: “wherein said information associated with the selected part of the physical document comprises a description of graphical data related to the selected part of the physical document, and wherein said audibly playing comprises audibly playing said description of said graphical data to the blind person on the user system”.

The Examiner argues: “With respect to **dependent claims 6-7, 15-17**as indicated in the above discussion Carro in view of Sussman, in further view of Sears teach the limitations of claim 1... Carro in view of Sussman do not teach presenting retrieved data orally to the blind person and extracting text from data and converting to be read audibly.

However, Sears teaches a system that works with scanners, OCR devices and other devices that reads text allowed to the user for the purposes of aiding visually impaired users. Sears expressly

mentions the process of assisting users with residual vision by scanning a documents and reading a section, indicated by the user gesture, aloud to the user. Sears, Carro and Sussman teach user assist devices and software that recognize”.

In response, Applicant respectfully contends that the preceding argument by the Examiner has not addressed the preceding feature of claim 16. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in relation to claim 16.

Accordingly, claim 16 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears.

#### Claim 10

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 10 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, because Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 10.

A first example of why claim 10 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears is that Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not teach or suggest the feature: “identifying a physical document; identifying and locating an electronic copy of said identified physical document ..., wherein the electronic copy of the document is an exact replica of the physical document.”

The Example argues: “Carro teaches ... Identifying a physical document (See Para 76,154) ... Identifying and locating an electronic copy of said identified document (see Para 90,148, 165)”.

In response, Applicant respectfully contends that Carro, Pars. [0090], [0148], and [0165] do not disclose “identifying and locating an electronic copy of said identified physical document ..., wherein the electronic copy of the document is an exact replica of the physical document”.

Carro, Par. [0090] recites “receiving and storing in said hyperlink table identification and location of information or service associated with each defined hyperlinked item” which discloses a hyperlink table that is not disclosed by Carro as being an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document identified in Carro, Par. [0076].

Carro, Par. [0148] discloses multimedia information that is not disclosed by Carro as being an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document identified in Carro, Par. [0076].

Carro, Par. [0090] discloses a hyperlink table that is not disclosed by Carro as being an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document identified in Carro, Par. [0076].

Therefore, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 10.

A second example of why claim 10 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears is that Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not teach or suggest the feature: “retrieving, from the electronic copy of the physical document, data related to the selected part of the physical document”.

The Example argues: “Carro teaches ... retrieving from the electronic copy of the physical document, data related to the selected part of the document (See Para 116)”.



In response, Applicant notes that Carro, Pars. [0116] recites: “an user workstation for accessing the information and/or the service associated with the hyperlinked items”, which does not even mention an electronic copy that is an exact replica of the physical document, let alone retrieving, from the electronic copy exact replica of the physical document, data related to the selected part of the document.

The bottom line is that the preceding feature of claim 10 claims retrieving data, related to the selected part of the document, from the electronic copy replica of the physical document, which Carro does not disclose.

Therefore, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears does not disclose the preceding feature of claim 10.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 10 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, and that claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claim 25**

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carro et al. (hereinafter Carro) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087598 published July 4, 2002, in view of Sussman et al. (hereinafter Sussman) U.S. Patent No. 5,586,196 issued Dec. 17, 1996, in further view of Sears et al. (hereinafter Sears) U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482 filed Oct. 22, 1998, in view of Schneider et al. (hereinafter Schneider) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156866 filed Apr. 19, 2001.

Since claim 25 depends from claim 1 which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claim 25 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, in view of Schneider under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 13-14, 18 and 28**

The Examiner rejected claims 13-14, 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carro et al. (hereinafter Carro) U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0087598 published July 4, 2002, in view of Sussman et al. (hereinafter Sussman) U.S. Patent No. 5,586,196 issued Dec. 17, 1996, in further view of Sears et al. (hereinafter Sears) U.S. Patent No. 6,115,482 filed Oct. 22, 1998, in view of Reichel et al. (hereinafter Reichel) U.S. Patent No. 5,960,448 filed Dec. 1995.

Since claims 13-14, 18 and 28 depend from claim 1 which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claims 13-14, 18 and 28 are not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, in view of Reichel under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In addition with respect to claim 18, Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, in view of Reichel does not disclose the feature:

“wherein the information associated with the physical document comprises speech instructions related to the physical document;

wherein the speech instructions comprise speech instructions for locating positions of bar codes on pages of the physical document;

wherein said audibly playing comprises audibly playing, to the blind person on the user system, said speech instructions for locating said positions of bar codes on pages of the physical document”.

The Examiner argues: “With respect to **dependent claims 13-14, 18 and 28**, as indicated in the above discussion Carro in view of Sussman in view of Sears teaches all the elements of

claim 1... Carro teaches identifying physical document (See Para 76); Carro in view of Sussman do not teach presenting retrieved data orally to the blind person and extracting text from data and converting to be read audibly... However, Sears teaches a system that works with scanners, OCR devices and other devices that reads text allowed to the user for the purposes of aiding visually impaired users. Sears expressly mentions the process of assisting users with residual vision by scanning a documents and reading a section, indicated by the user gesture, aloud to the user. Sears, Carro and Sussman teach user assist devices and software that recognize elements of a document and perform a function on the element (See col. 2, lines 30-41, coll. 4, lines 10-35, col. 9, lines 20-67) ... Moreover, Carro in view of Sussman in view of Sears does not teach reading a document of page via barcode reader... Reichek teaches reading a document and page ID using a barcode reader (See Figure 14 and column 3, lines 55-67 and column 16, bottom). Reichek teaches visually enhancing a document to assist the user while reading the document.”

In response, Applicant respectfully contends that the preceding argument by the Examiner has not addressed the preceding feature of claim 18. Thus, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness in relation to claim 18.

Accordingly, claim 18 is not unpatentable over Carro in view of Sussman in further view of Sears, in view of Reichek .

## CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM). The Attorney's reference number for this case is END-8841.

Date: November 16, 2010

/ Jack P. Friedman /  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688

Customer No. 30449  
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302  
Latham, New York 12110  
Telephone (518) 220-1850  
Facsimile (518) 220-1857  
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com